



Wednesday, 9 January 1957,
at 3.15 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 24:	
Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa: reports of the Governments of India and of Pakistan (<i>concluded</i>)	39

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARPÉR (Turkey).

AGENDA ITEM 24

Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa: reports of the Governments of India and of Pakistan (A/3186, A/3188, A/SPC/L.3 and Add.1) (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Philippine delegation had become a sponsor of the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.3).
2. Mr. MALILE (Albania) said that the General Assembly was discussing the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa for the tenth time and it had not yet been able to find a satisfactory solution. The responsibility for that regrettable state of affairs lay with the Union Government, which refused to co-operate with the General Assembly and was continuing its policy of racial discrimination in contempt of all the Assembly's relevant recommendations. The absence of the delegation of the Union of South Africa was not calculated to facilitate a settlement, and it was natural that the Governments of India and Pakistan should wish the item to remain on the Assembly's agenda so long as no settlement had been arrived at.
3. The principle of respect for human rights without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion was a fundamental principle of international law enshrined in the United Nations Charter. It was most regrettable that a Member State of the United Nations should be flouting that principle. The policy of discrimination practised by the Union of South Africa was based on the Fascist policy of racial discrimination. The laws and regulations of the Union were enacted by a white minority representing one-fifth of the total population of the Union. The remaining four-fifths of the population were thus deprived of their rights and fundamental freedoms, and driven out of their homes while their property was unlawfully expropriated. There was no lack of evidence concerning the deplorable state of affairs prevailing in the Union of South Africa. The Bandung Conference of 1955, in which twenty-nine Asian and African countries had participated, had denounced the policy of oppression applied by the Government of the Union of South Africa to the non-European population of the Union as a flagrant violation of human rights and of the principles of the Charter.
4. The Government of the Union of South Africa claimed that the race problem under discussion was a

matter essentially within its domestic jurisdiction and that consequently any intervention in the problem by the United Nations constituted intervention in internal affairs, which was prohibited by the Charter. That argument had been very cogently refuted by many delegations and his own delegation would not return to that aspect of the question. But it would like to congratulate the Governments of India and Pakistan on the conciliatory attitude which they had consistently adopted towards the Union of South Africa. Their attitude was in pointed contrast to that of certain delegations which professed attachment to the principle of respect for human rights, but, when the issue was that of defending those rights, recanted and by their behaviour implicitly supported the position assumed by the Union of South Africa. His delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.3 and Add.1).

5. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that the General Assembly was debating the item for the tenth time, for a settlement had not yet materialized despite the many resolutions which had been adopted. Nevertheless the debates in the Assembly had served a purpose, and the question should remain on the agenda until it had been settled in a satisfactory manner.

6. He regretted the absence of the delegation of the Union of South Africa from the proceedings, for it would have been able to give the Special Political Committee information on certain points. There were three factors having a material bearing on the question: the treaty between the Government of India and the Government of the Union of South Africa; respect for human rights as set forth in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and resolution 919 (X) adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth session. In the letter addressed to the permanent representative of India (A/3186, annex II) the permanent representative of the Union of South Africa had noted that the offer of the Government of India had been made "in pursuance of the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations" and that the proposed discussions would be held in New York which was the Headquarters of the United Nations. Actually, General Assembly resolution 919 (X) to which the permanent representative of the Union had been referring, merely urged the parties to pursue negotiations and to report to the General Assembly at its next session. In the same paragraph of his letter, the representative of the Union had referred to the attitude consistently taken up by his Government with regard to the competence of the United Nations. It was unclear which aspect of the question the Union Government had in mind in contesting the competence of the United Nations. The Organization had an unchallengeable competence to consider the violation of an international agreement.

7. During the debate the representative of Argentina had rightly said that the technical assistance offered by the United Nations to States had not in any way

infringed their sovereignty. Technical assistance was merely one way of implementing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, for its object was to raise the standards of living of under-privileged populations and to enable them to enjoy all the benefits of civilization. Similarly, therefore, the principle of the sovereignty of States could not be pleaded in a case involving the violation of the human rights proclaimed in the Declaration.

8. It had been suggested that the United Nations, having been unable to make any progress towards a settlement, should drop the item. His delegation did not agree. By discussing the question, the United Nations was keeping it before public opinion which demanded that it should be settled. Besides, the General Assembly's sole object was to promote more friendly relations between the Government of the Union of South Africa and the Governments of India and Pakistan, in order that they might enter into negotiations with a view to settling their dispute. That was the purpose of the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.3 and Add.1). The Uruguayan delegation would accordingly vote for that draft resolution.

9. There was also great merit in the suggestions made by the representative of Peru, who at the 8th meeting had referred to the machinery for the pacific settlement of disputes described in the Charter. The opportunities offered by Chapter VI did, in fact, seem to have been neglected.

10. Mr. KIERNIK (Poland) said the absence of the South African delegation was regrettable, for the problems before the United Nations could only be settled by exchanges of opinion and free discussions between Member States. His delegation did not intend to enter into the substance of the question. The representative of India had very ably dealt with the entire matter in his statement at the 7th meeting. The Polish delegation noted with concern that the Government of the Union of South Africa had not abandoned its policy of discrimination against persons of Indian origin, but was continuing to apply it. The discriminatory measures affecting those elements of the population were only a part of the general policy of *apartheid* applied in the Union of South Africa, and his delegation reserved the right to comment on that policy at the appropriate time.

11. During the Second World War, Poland had suffered from Hitler's policy of racial discrimination, and consequently was particularly concerned over similar measures taken in respect of certain populations. It had always condemned such measures. All discriminatory practices were strictly prohibited under Polish law which laid down severe penalties for persons guilty of them. His delegation's position was accordingly perfectly clear: it would support any action taken by the United Nations with a view to the elimination of discrimination in all its forms, and would accordingly vote for the joint draft resolution. He hoped that the Government of the Union of South Africa would yield to world public opinion and would agree to engage in negotiations with the Governments of India and of Pakistan as the Assembly had recommended, with a view to settling the question in the spirit of the Charter, to the benefit of people of Indian origin living in the Union of South Africa and in the best interests of all the countries concerned.

12. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) deeply regretted the absence of the South African delegation, whose participation in the debate might greatly have facilitated the settlement of the question. The non-

participation of the Union Government should not, however, discourage the General Assembly from seeking a settlement of the question, as the continuance of the situation prevailing in the Union tended to jeopardize harmonious relations between the States concerned and might endanger the peace of the world.

13. The item had been on the General Assembly's agenda for ten years. The Assembly had passed numerous resolutions and had appealed to the Union Government to conform its racial policies to the principles which were set forth in the Charter, and which had been solemnly accepted by the Union of South Africa by virtue of its membership in the United Nations. However, the Union Government had never heeded the General Assembly's recommendations and had consistently refused even to enter into negotiations with India and Pakistan, on the pretext that the question was basically one of domestic jurisdiction and that the United Nations therefore had no competence to deal with it. The Union Government had invoked Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter in support of its argument. The Ethiopian Government was determined to uphold the proper application of that paragraph but did not agree that it applied in the particular instance, for two reasons: first, the discriminatory legislation enacted by the Union Government violated international agreements concluded between the Union and India; secondly, the discriminatory measures applied to certain groups of the Union population affected not only those people but also population groups elsewhere in the world, and more particularly the coloured populations of other areas. The measures affected all who believed in human brotherhood and had faith in the dignity and worth of the human person. To deny the competence of the United Nations to deal with matters of that character was to deny the very purpose for which the Organization had been established.

14. The Union Government maintained that racial discrimination had been practised for a long time in South Africa, that it was part of the country's institutions and that hence it could not be eradicated overnight. That argument was understandable and the Union Government would have mobilized greater sympathy had it shown the slightest degree of co-operation in seeking an ultimate solution of the problem and had it shown its intention to move in the right direction. Unfortunately, that had not been the case. The Union Government believed in the justice and fairness of its policy of racial discrimination and had shown its determination to go ahead with that policy regardless of what other people all over the world thought of it. In the view of the Ethiopian delegation, the Union Government was following a mistaken course, for its racial policy was harmful not only to the victims of that policy. It was damaging to the Union of South Africa itself, because new African nations were attaining independence every day and if the Union of South Africa persisted in its discriminatory policy, its position in Africa, in the midst of coloured populations, would soon become difficult and perhaps untenable. The Ethiopian delegation therefore hoped that the Union Government would try to find its way towards the solution of that grave problem before it was too late.

15. Though the Ethiopian delegation considered the joint draft resolution excessively moderate, it would nevertheless vote for it because the overriding object was to obtain South Africa's co-operation, not to condemn its attitude.

16. Mr. ORTEGA (Chile) said that his delegation had voted for the various resolutions in which the Assembly had urged the discontinuance of a policy that was in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Unfortunately, the Union of South Africa had consistently refused to heed those resolutions, which had been adopted by large majorities. It was regrettable that the South African delegation was not participating in the debate. The Union Government contended that the matter was essentially domestic and outside the competence of the United Nations. The General Assembly, on the other hand, considering that an international problem was involved, had kept the item on its agenda and was pressing for a settlement.

17. All the Member States, including those not directly concerned, should give their fullest attention to the problem, for the difficulties were apparently becoming more serious and the discriminatory policy of the Union of South Africa threatened to have a harmful effect on the Union's relations with India and Pakistan. The situation might conceivably even affect other countries and lead to grave complications in international relations.

18. The Chilean delegation adhered steadfastly to its position; it did not underestimate the importance of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, but it was convinced that that clause had to be construed in the light of the other provisions of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The United Nations should endeavour to induce the parties to settle their difference, and it was that spirit of conciliation which had been the motive of the sponsors in proposing the joint draft resolution. Some delegations had pointed out that earlier resolutions had been ineffective. That was true, but the United Nations nevertheless had the duty to continue its efforts to exert its moral influence. In the past, the Union of South Africa had refused to accept United Nations intervention in settling the question, but it was unlikely that the Union would be able to defy world opinion much longer. The decisions of the United Nations were contributory factors in the formation of that opinion and therefore the General Assembly should reaffirm its position and adopt the joint draft resolution of which the Chilean delegation was one of the sponsors.

19. Mr. SHARIF (Indonesia) regretted the absence of the representative of the Union of South Africa, for much more understanding could have been achieved if that representative had been present to explain his country's views to the Committee. The question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa had been the subject of lengthy discussion in the past and all the delegations had attempted to seek a solution, without any intention of infringing the sovereignty of the Union of South Africa.

20. At its tenth session, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 919 (X), but that resolution had remained ineffective; despite the sincere efforts of India and of Pakistan to arrange for negotiations, the Union of South Africa had declined to enter upon them, as was evident from the reports of the Governments of India and of Pakistan (A/3186, A/3188). He wished to consider the various arguments offered by the Union of South Africa as justification for its refusal. The Union Government said that the Indian Prime Minister had attacked the Union of South Africa in two public statements. However, the Governments of India and of Pakistan had shown ample good will in the letters

included in their reports to the Union Government. It was true that the Governments of India and Pakistan had proposed that negotiations should be held in New York, but it was probable that they would have been willing to consider any alternative meeting place. Lastly, the Union of South Africa had invoked Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter to challenge the competence of the United Nations. The matter had been debated at length and it was apparent that that paragraph could not be divorced from the other provisions of the Charter.

21. The mere fact that the item had been on the agenda for so long was ample proof of the importance attributed to it by the Members of the Assembly. At the tenth session, the Members had thought that they had found a satisfactory solution but they now had to admit their failure, due to the uncompromising attitude of the Union Government which had, in fact, proceeded with measures which could only make a solution of the question more difficult. And yet, as some previous speakers had emphasized, the situation was capable of endangering international peace and security.

22. The Assembly therefore had the duty to continue its consideration of the problem. The repetition of the same arguments might of course seem monotonous to some, but the Assembly would be failing in its duty if it did not try to arrive at a solution. Moreover, the Union of South Africa could not continue to ignore world opinion. For those reasons, the Indonesian delegation supported the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.3 and Add.1) which, in its opinion, was the minimum for which the General Assembly could ask at the moment.

23. Mr. BOGDAN (Romania) said his delegation's views on the subject were based on certain fundamental considerations. First, the situation was clearly one which, in the terms of Article 14 of the Charter, was likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations. The question, being of an international character, was therefore within the competence of the General Assembly. The Union of South Africa had itself recognized that international character when it had agreed to negotiations with India and Pakistan. Secondly, the situation could have implications which went far beyond the framework of the relations among the three States. Racial discrimination was inconsistent with the principles of the Charter and constituted a permanent source of international distrust and tension. The United Nations could not adopt an attitude of complacency; that was particularly true since acts of racial discrimination were taking place in other countries, too.

24. It had been said that the Committee should proceed in a spirit of mutual understanding and seek a formula that could strike a balance between the conflicting interests. It had also been said that the white population in the Union of South Africa faced the danger of being swamped by the great mass of non-whites. The Romanian delegation firmly believed in the method of conciliation but was equally firm in the conviction that international peace and security had to be based on the total abolition of racial or national discrimination. The only way to safeguard human rights in a multi-racial State was to apply a régime of complete equality. Romania had in the past experienced the wrongs of racial discrimination but had since taken action to prohibit discrimination in any form. The Romanian delegation, guided by the considerations he had mentioned, would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft

resolution, which was consistent with the resolutions previously adopted by the Assembly and represented an effort to find an equitable solution to a difficult problem. The members of the Committee should not be discouraged by the fact that the draft resolution seemed to contribute nothing new. In the absence of a more effective method, the Assembly should not be afraid to repeat itself, thereby affirming its confidence in its moral influence. It would be much more discouraging if it washed its hands of the question, as that would give the impression that it shirked its responsibilities whenever it encountered difficulties. Naturally, the most satisfactory solution would be for the parties to settle the question themselves, but the Assembly should co-operate in seeking a solution so long as the question remained before it. The Assembly had maintained its stand with regard to its competence to consider the question. It had taken a decision on the matter itself, without consulting the International Court of Justice, as some had recommended. Consequently, there was no need to revert to that point.

26. His delegation vigorously opposed any form of segregation. It would vote for the joint draft resolution, as an expression of its desire to eliminate every form of discrimination and to restore international harmony. It hoped that the Assembly's effort would not be in vain, for it had confidence in the moral authority of the United Nations.

27. Mr. SHALFAN (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation had always supported the inclusion in the Assembly's agenda of the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa, because it considered that the Union's policy of discrimination was contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

28. Saudi Arabia had always considered that a dispute should be settled by peaceful means, by direct negotiation between the parties. The Union of South Africa refused to enter into negotiations and questioned the competence of the United Nations, using Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter in support of its argument. Such a line was untenable, since Article 10 empowered the General Assembly to discuss any matters within the scope of the Charter.

29. There was a humanitarian aspect to the question. No country was entitled to pursue a policy based on racial segregation. His delegation had hoped that the Government of the Union of South Africa would enter into negotiations, but it had not done so, for reasons of dubious validity. As the Union Government had always disregarded the General Assembly's resolutions and had decided to withdraw from the Committee, his delegation had hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would use more forceful language and that their proposal would condemn the Union Government's position. However, he congratulated the sponsors on the initiative they had taken and said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

30. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said that his delegation would define its position on racial discrimination when the policy of *apartheid* was under discussion. Japan had always supported the principle of non-discrimination. It knew from long experience, however, that racial questions were so delicate that they required the most tactful and cautious approach. In the present case, the co-operation of the parties concerned was most important, and the Assembly should endeavour to create an atmosphere favourable to such

co-operation. His delegation felt that the joint draft resolution took those considerations into account, and it would vote in favour of it. It would do so, however, on the understanding that the phrase "with regret" in operative paragraph 2 did not in any way imply doubt as to the good faith of the Union of South Africa.

31. Thakin TUN ANT (Burma) observed that the Government of the Union of South Africa continued to maintain that, under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the United Nations was not competent to discuss the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. Resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly had been disregarded, thereby making the situation worse. It was true that the United Nations could not impose a decision on any Member, but it should continue to promote the effective observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all and to endeavour to improve the lot of the victims of racial discrimination in the Union of South Africa.

32. Mr. BONSAI (United States of America) noted that the question before the Special Political Committee had been debated on repeated occasions but that as yet no concrete results had been achieved. His delegation continued to believe that only the parties concerned could settle the dispute and it hoped that the moral authority of the United Nations would persuade them to enter into negotiations. It was regrettable that those negotiations had not taken place and that the delegation of the Union of South Africa, questioning the competence of the United Nations in the matter, had withdrawn from the General Assembly. Although the views of his Government on the question were at variance with those of the Union Government, his delegation deplored the fact that the General Assembly's unproductive efforts to settle the question had deprived the United Nations of the co-operation of a country which had played a leading role in many endeavours, including the establishment both of the League of Nations and of the United Nations, and which had supported the United Nations in its resistance to aggression.

33. His delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution, which well expressed the consistent attitude of the General Assembly. It did not believe that any purpose would be served by providing for the automatic reinclusion of the item in the agenda of the Assembly's twelfth session and it was glad to find that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had not included any such provision.

34. Mr. LIU Chieh (China) said that he would not go into the substance of the matter in the absence of the delegation of the Union of South Africa, but would merely point out that the question had two aspects; one being connected with racial discrimination and human rights and the other, with a dispute involving several countries. The first aspect fell within the scope of another item on the Committee's agenda, the question of race conflict resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Union of South Africa. The second aspect should be borne in mind in the endeavour to persuade the parties to enter into direct negotiations. It should be recalled that the Government of the Union of South Africa had already declared that it had never closed its doors to negotiations; the Governments of India and Pakistan, for their part, were prepared to pursue further negotiations with the Union. In those circumstances, the joint draft resolution was an appropriate step, and his delegation would therefore vote for it.

35. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) pointed out that the question of racial discrimination could not be confined within national boundaries, and all discriminatory practices should be abolished. The Israel delegation supported the joint draft resolution before the Committee, as it provided for direct negotiations which were one of the best methods of settling disputes. His delegation hoped that the parties concerned would, as a first step in that direction, endeavour not to aggravate the situation further and would not delay the start of negotiations. In voting for that draft resolution, it did not intend to pass judgement on the conduct of a country which was not taking part in the Committee's proceedings.

36. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan) deplored the fact that discrimination still existed in the twentieth century. In the Union of South Africa there was discrimination not only against people of Indian origin but also against all non-whites. The Sudanese people viewed that situation with great concern.

37. The joint draft resolution was much too mild in its treatment of the Union Government, which had not heeded any of the General Assembly's resolutions and refused to co-operate with the United Nations. Stronger measures were necessary, as all Members, on signing the Charter, had affirmed their faith in fundamental human rights and had declared themselves resolved to promote social progress and better standards of life. Nevertheless, the draft resolution constituted an attempt to reach a solution acceptable to all the parties concerned and his delegation would accordingly support it.

38. Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece) noted that at the tenth session of the General Assembly the Greek delegation had voted in favour of resolution 919 (X) on the item at present under discussion. Maintaining the same position, he would vote for the joint draft resolution, since the United Nations must demonstrate its continued interest in the fate of the victims of the racial discrimination practised in the Union of South Africa. It was regrettable that the Union Government had not seen fit to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly. He hoped that that position would be reconsidered in the future, as the pressure of public opinion always produced results in the end.

39. Mr. ABIDIA (Libya) deplored the negative stand taken by the South African delegation in withdrawing from the General Assembly. He supported the joint draft resolution and hoped that the Committee would approve it by a large majority.

40. Mr. ALLOUNI (Syria) feared that the draft resolution before the Committee would serve no useful purpose, as the Union Government did not respect the dignity of the human person or the humanitarian principles embodied in the Charter and disregarded the wishes of the General Assembly. Although the draft resolution was not worded strongly enough, his delegation would vote for it in the absence of a more satisfactory solution.

41. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) said that the French delegation, for juridical reasons, would abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution. That attitude did not imply approval of the Union Government's policy, since racist theories were completely alien to the French people. There was one principle, however, that could not be sacrificed: the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which constituted an essential safeguard and placed practical limitations on the actions of the United Nations, must therefore be respected. The United Nations had failed to solve the problem under

discussion precisely because it had exceeded its powers. Every time it did so, it would be reduced to impotence and would impair its prestige.

42. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) said that he considered that the joint draft resolution dealt with matters which were the domestic affairs of a State and that he would therefore abstain from voting on it. The Indian representative had stated that Australia had taken sides on the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. That was not the case: the Australian delegation had always refrained from discussing the substance of the question and had abstained from voting on any of the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee. Nevertheless, at the ninth session of the General Assembly, the Australian delegation, without prejudice to its position on Article 2, paragraph 7, had voted in favour of operative paragraph 2 of resolution 816 (IX), in which the General Assembly had suggested that the Governments of India, Pakistan and the Union of South Africa should seek a solution of the question by direct negotiation.

43. With regard to the joint draft resolution, his delegation would have been happy if operative paragraph 5, which affirmed the competence of the United Nations, had been omitted, since it could not accept that view. On the other hand, it noted with appreciation the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution had omitted the suggestion that the parties should report to the General Assembly at its next session, which had appeared in resolution 919 (X). As long as the General Assembly insisted that discussions take place under its aegis, no progress would be made.

44. Mr. TALAAT (Egypt) said that he would vote for the joint draft resolution, which represented the minimum that could be expected of the General Assembly.

45. Mr. SINGH (India) observed that the discussion had revealed the unity of views in the Special Political Committee. Virtually all the representatives who had spoken on the substance of the question had expressed the view that the Union Government's policy of racial discrimination was contrary to the Charter and to the best interests not only of the people of Indian origin but also of the whites themselves.

46. In reply to the observations made by the Australian and United Kingdom representatives, he explained that when he had stated that their Governments had consistently voted against the Indian proposals, he had meant that he had never had their support. He appreciated their position, but felt that Australia and the United Kingdom should on future occasions exercise their moral responsibilities more fully.

47. India, which had supported all the many procedures for settlement of the question proposed in the past, would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution and would duly arrange to report to the General Assembly at its next session. He hoped that the attitude of the Union Government would make it possible for that report to be more heartening than the previous one.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution of Argentina, Chile, El Salvador, Mexico, Philippines and Yugoslavia (A/SPC/L.3 and Add.1).

The joint draft resolution was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

49. Mr. DE LOJENDIO (Spain) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the inclusion of the item in the agenda. It had also abstained in the

vote on the joint draft resolution. To avoid any misinterpretation, however, he wished to emphasize how strongly his country, which had always maintained the principle of the equality of races, hoped for a rapid solution of the problem.

50. Mr. JASPER (United Kingdom) welcomed the spirit of moderation which had been displayed in the Committee's debate. His delegation had abstained from voting on the joint draft resolution for a number of reasons.

51. In the first place, it hoped that its friends would reach a satisfactory settlement. The fact that it had never expressed a view on the substance of the problem was not to be interpreted as implying that the United Kingdom had no interest in the question. His country was not pessimistic: from its experience in the field of human affairs it had learned that families did not always agree. That was true of the Commonwealth, whose strength consisted precisely in the fact that it was constituted on the basis of unity and diversity.

52. Secondly, his delegation's attitude to the draft resolution was dictated by uncertainty on the question

of jurisdiction, although the United Kingdom had never expressed a view in the matter.

53. Thirdly, his delegation had certain reservations on operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution. Paragraph 3 implied that the blame was on one side, whereas in his delegation's experience, there were always two sides in a matter of that kind. As regards paragraph 4, the United Kingdom had abstained from voting on resolution 926 (X) and so could not approve that paragraph, as it referred to that resolution. Lastly, the United Kingdom was unable to accept paragraph 5, as it envisaged report by the parties to the General Assembly, and the United Kingdom delegation was uncertain as to the propriety of such a procedure.

54. He welcomed the fact that the draft resolution did not provide for the automatic reinclusion of the item in the agenda of the twelfth session. To avoid any misunderstanding, he wished to state that in his delegation's view the item's inclusion in the agenda of the current session had not been automatic. It had been expressly requested by the delegations of India and of Pakistan.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.